

### **REMARKS**

This paper responds to the Office Action of May 2, 2005, with the following paragraphs corresponding to the detailed paragraphs of the Office Action.

#### ***Specification***

A new Abstract of the Disclosure is provided on a separate sheet, in a single paragraph in narrative form. It is also seen that legal phraseology is not employed.

#### ***Claim Objections***

Definitions are now provided in claims 1-5, as required in the Office Action. In addition, on claim 4, line 6, the definite article "the" deleted, thereby obviating the issue of antecedent basis.

On information and belief, the definitions are drawn from the specification and/or would be known to one of ordinary skill in the field of noise detection. If there are any problems relating to such definitions, it would be appreciated if the Examiner were to telephone Counsel so that the Applicant can be contacted for purposes of resolving the problem.

#### ***Allowable Subject Matter***

Applicants acknowledge the substantive allowability of the subject matter of claims 1-5, and inasmuch as they are amended in order to remove the objections, it is respectfully submitted that they are now in allowable condition.

#### ***Information Disclosure Statement***

Attached is an Information Disclosure Statement which was inadvertently not supplied earlier. The references are not any more pertinent than those already cited by the Examiner. They are discussed below:

Charles et al. (US 4,628,737) disclose a method and device for locating and characterizing flaws in a known submerged metal structure. Charles et al. do not teach or suggest that one should calculate the functional  $f$  and minimize the functional  $f$  in order to determine the

direction of the noise sources.

Steber et al. (US 4,811,250) disclose a system for determining the positions of a set of points on a body and comparing those points to a set of reference points. Steber et al. do not teach or suggest that one should calculate the functional  $f$  and minimize the functional  $f$  in order to determine the direction of the noise sources.

Maringer (DE 27 04 511) discloses a device for determining the positions of a set of points on a car and comparing those points to a set of reference points. Maringer does not teach or suggest that one should calculate the functional  $f$  and minimize the functional  $f$  in order to determine the direction of the noise sources.

In view of the above remarks, favorable reconsideration is courteously requested.

If there are any residual issues which can be expeditiously resolved by a telephone conference, the Examiner is courteously invited to telephone Counsel at the number indicated below, and if Counsel is not available, please contact Counsel's assistant, Mrs. Richardson at 703-812-5326, and she will have another attorney continue with the prosecution of the application.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any fees associated with this response or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 13-3402.

Respectfully submitted,



I. William Millen, Reg. No. 19,544  
Attorney/Agent for Applicant(s)

MILLEN, WHITE, ZELANO  
& BRANIGAN, P.C.  
Arlington Courthouse Plaza 1, Suite 1400  
2200 Clarendon Boulevard  
Arlington, Virginia 22201  
Telephone: (703) 243-6333  
Facsimile: (703) 243-6410

Attorney Docket No.: LOM-0034

Date: August 2, 2005  
IWM: pdr